

### **Remarks**

Claims 39-42 and 45-76 are currently pending. In accordance with the Examiner's restriction requirement, Claims 59-76 have been cancelled. However, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue any of Claims 59-76, and/or the contents recited therein, in one or more separate patent applications at such time as the Applicant deems appropriate.

The Examiner is thanked for granting an interview with the Applicant's representative. During the interview, the novel aspects of the Applicant's invention were discussed in detail, particularly in light of existing technology, including that which is disclosed by the references cited by the Examiner. Specifically, the Applicant's representative pointed out, and the Examiner agreed, that none of the references discloses: 1) removing one or more intra-frames (I-frames) from a first portion of a multimedia content stream, 2) substituting the removed I-frames with *false* I-frames, and 3) storing the removed I-frames as a second portion of the multimedia content stream on a multimedia server. As discussed with the Examiner, the I-frames are substituted in a manner that prevents a user from viewing the multimedia content using the first portion alone. As a result, the user is required to access the multimedia server, access the second portion of the stream (comprising the removed I-frames), and reconstruct the original multimedia content stream by combining the first and second portions of the original multimedia content stream.

Prior to the Applicant's efforts, the process of substituting I-frames in the manner discussed above was not known. As a result, it was agreed that inclusion of this substituting step in the claims would be sufficient to overcome the cited art of record. Therefore, in accordance with the interview, the Applicant has amended Independent Claim 39 to specifically recite the novel features agreed during the interview. Specifically, the term "reference images" was deleted and replaced with the term "I-frames", to further specify the type of video program/sequences affected by the substituting

process. Support for the amendments to Claim 39 may be found, for example, at paragraphs [0103], [0110], and [0111] of the specification. None of the other claims were amended and no new matter has been added.

The Applicant fully acknowledges the rejection of Claims 39-58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al. (U.S. 6,675,384) in view of Decinque (U.S. 6,286,139) in further view of Roman et al. (U.S. 7,191,462). In light of the interview, and of the amendments to Claim 39, the Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this grounds of rejection.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that a further telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for the Applicant

TDC/nn  
(215) 656-3381